

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/767,249	01/28/2004	John R. Stuelpnagel	ILLINC.59CPCPC2	4783	
20995 KNOBBE MA	7590 10/08/200 RTENS OLSON & BE	EXAM	EXAMINER		
2040 MAIN STREET			BAUGHMAN	BAUGHMAN, MOLLY E	
	FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			PAPER NUMBER	
			1637		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/08/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)						
10/767,249	STUELPNAGEL ET	NAGEL ET AL.					
Examiner	Art Unit						
Molly E. Baughman	1637						

	Molly E. Baughman	1637	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appendor for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailling date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period to knuder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS.	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,	
<ul> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):     Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).  ∩ or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)    how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
	Wanneth D Harlield		

/Kenneth R Horlick/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637 Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 U.S.C. 102(b) - Nova et al. (US 6,340,588): 35 U.S.C. 103 - Nova et al. in view of Fodor et al. (US 5,500,922): S U.S.C. 103(a) - Nova et al. (US 6,340,588), in view of Overbeck et al. (US 6,289,480); and nonstatutory obvious-type double patenting - US 7,060,431.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments over nonstatutory obvioustype double patenting - US 6,86,394 are not persuasive. Applicant argued that the Examiner has not met the cupied burden of
establishing a prima facie case of why a species would be obvious in view of a disclosed genus, citing MPEP 2144.08. This is not
persuasive because The Office is not required to establish a prima facie case when a species is disclosed in specification, as explained in
the Office Action dated 5/16/2008. In reiteration, pg4-5 of the Office Action states, "the MPEP states in chapter 804, "[T]hose portions of
the specification which provide support for the patent claims may also be examined and considered when addressing the issue of whether a
claim in the application defines an obvious variation of the invention claimed in the patent." The MPEP further toes that the cour in Vogel
recognized 'that' it is most difficult, if not meaningless, to try to say what is or is not an obvious variation of the claim," but that one can
judge whether or not the invention claimed in an application is an obvious variation of an embodiment disclosed in the patent which
provides support for the patent claim. According to the court, one must first "determine how much of the patent disclosure pertains to the
invention claimed in the patent "Decause only "(Pilis portion of the specification supports the patent claims and spe considered." The
court pointed out that "this use of the disclosure is not in contravention of the cases forbidding its use as prior art, nor is it applying the
patent as a reference under 35 U.S.C, 103 since only the disclosure of the invention claimed in the patent which